arXiv:1604.06878v2 [math.CO] 25 Aug 2016

On the performance of optimal double circulant even codes

T. Aaron Gulliver* and Masaaki Harada†

August 26, 2016

Abstract

In this note, we investigate the performance of optimal double circulant even codes which are not self-dual, as measured by the decoding error probability in bounded distance decoding. To do this, we classify the optimal double circulant even codes that are not self-dual which have the smallest weight distribution for lengths up to 72. We also give some restrictions on the weight distributions of (extremal) self-dual $[54, 27, 10]$ codes with shadows of minimum weight 3. Finally, we consider the performance of extremal self-dual codes of lengths 88 and 112.

1 Introduction

A (binary) $[n, k]$ *code* C is a k-dimensional vector subspace of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, where $\mathbb{F}_2$ denotes the finite field of order 2. All codes in this note are binary. The parameter n is called the *length* of C. The *weight* $\mathrm{wt}(x)$ of a vector $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is the number of non-zero components of x. A vector of C is called a *codeword*. The minimum non-zero weight of all codewords in C is called the *minimum weight* of C and an $[n, k]$ code with minimum weight d is called an $[n, k, d]$

*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Victoria, P.O. Box 1700, STN CSC, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 2Y2. email: agullive@ece.uvic.ca

†Research Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University, Sendai 980–8579, Japan. email: mharada@m.tohoku.ac.jp.

code. A code with only even weights is called *even*. Two codes are *equivalent* if one can be obtained from the other by a permutation of coordinates.

Let C be an $[n, k, d]$ code. Throughout this note, let A_i denote the number of codewords of weight i in C. The sequence $(A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ is called the *weight distribution* of C. A code C of length n is said to be *formally self-dual* if C and $C^\perp$ have identical weight distributions, where $C^\perp$ is the dual code of C. A code C is *isodual* if C and $C^\perp$ are equivalent, and C is *self-dual* if $C = C^\perp$. A self-dual code is an even isodual code, and an isodual code is a formally self-dual code. There are formally self-dual even codes which are not self-dual. One reason for our interest in formally self-dual even codes is that for some lengths there are formally self-dual even codes with larger minimum weights than any self-dual code of that length. Double circulant codes are a remarkable class of isodual codes.

The question of decoding error probabilities was studied by Faldum, Lafuente, Ochoa and Willems [9] for bounded distance decoding. Let C and C' be $[n, k, d]$ codes with weight distributions $(A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ and $(A'_0, A'_1, \ldots, A'_n)$, respectively. Suppose that symbol errors are independent and the symbol error probability is small. Then C has a smaller decoding error probability than C' if and only if

$$(A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n) \prec (A'_0, A'_1, \ldots, A'_n), \tag{1}$$

where $\prec$ means the lexicographic order, that is, there is an integer $s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $A_i = A'_i$ for all $i < s$ but $A_s < A'_s$ [9, Theorem 3.4]. We say that C *performs better* than C' if (1) holds. By making use of [9, Theorem 3.4], Bouyuklieva, Malevich and Willems [2] investigated and compared the performance of extremal doubly even and singly even self-dual codes.

In this note, we consider the performance of optimal double circulant even codes which are not self-dual using [9, Theorem 3.4]. To do this, we classify the optimal double circulant even codes that are not self-dual which have the smallest weight distribution for lengths up to 72. For $(2n, d) = (32, 8)$, $(36, 8)$, $(38, 8)$, $(40, 8)$, $(46, 10)$, $(52, 10)$, $(56, 12)$, $(60, 12)$, $(62, 12)$, $(64, 12)$, $(66, 12)$ and $(68, 12)$, we demonstrate that there is an optimal double circulant even $[2n, n, d]$ code C which is not self-dual such that C performs better than any self-dual $[2n, n, d]$ code. We also give some restrictions on weight distributions of (extremal) self-dual $[54, 27, 10]$ codes having shadows of minimum weight 3. Finally, we consider the performance of extremal self-dual codes of lengths 88 and 112.

2 Double circulant codes

An $n \times n$ circulant matrix has the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & \cdots & r_n \\ r_n & r_1 & r_2 & \cdots & r_{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ r_2 & r_3 & r_4 & \cdots & r_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

so that each successive row is a cyclic shift of the previous one. A *pure double circulant* code and a *bordered double circulant* code have generator matrices of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_n & R \end{pmatrix} \tag{2}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} & \alpha & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ & 1 & & & \\ I_n & \vdots & & R' & \\ & 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

respectively, where I_n is the identity matrix of order n, R (resp. R') is an $n \times n$ (resp. $n-1 \times n-1$) circulant matrix, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_2$. These two families are called *double circulant* codes. Since we consider only even codes in this note, $\alpha = 0$ if n is even and $\alpha = 1$ if n is odd.

It is a fundamental problem to classify double circulant codes over binary and nonbinary fields as well as finite rings, for modest lengths, up to equivalence. There has been significant research on finding double circulant self-dual codes with the large minimum weights (see e.g., [12], [13], [14], [16]). Beyond self-dual codes, few results on the classification of double circulant codes are known (see e.g., [10]). One reason for this is that the classification of double circulant codes which are not self-dual is much more difficult than double circulant self-dual codes.

In this note, we consider codes C satisfying the following conditions:

(C1) C is a pure (resp. bordered) double circulant even code of length $2n$ which is not self-dual.

(C2) C has the largest minimum weight d_P (resp. d_B) among pure (resp. bordered) double circulant codes of length $2n$ which are not self-dual.

(C3) C has the smallest weight distribution $(A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ under the lexicographic order $\prec$ among pure (resp. bordered) double circulant even codes of length $2n$ and minimum weight d_P (resp. d_B) which are not self-dual.

We say that a double circulant even code which is not self-dual is *optimal* if it has the largest minimum weight among all double circulant even codes of that length which are not self-dual.

The following lemma is trivial.

Lemma 1. *If C is a pure double circulant even code of length $2n$ with generator matrix (2), then every row of R has odd weight. If C is a bordered double circulant even code of length $2n$ with generator matrix (3), then every row of R' has even weight.*

3 Weight enumerators

The weight enumerator W of a formally self-dual even code of length $2n$ can be represented as an integral combination of Gleason polynomials (see [21]), so that

$$W = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor n/4 \rfloor} a_j (1+y^2)^{n-4j} \{y^2(1-y^2)^2\}^j, \tag{4}$$

for some integers a_j with $a_0 = 1$. Note that the weight enumerators of formally self-dual even codes of length $2n$ as well as self-dual codes of length $2n$ can be expressed using (4). This is one of the reasons why we compare the performance of optimal double circulant even codes which are not self-dual with self-dual codes having the largest minimum weight.

For the following parameters

$$\begin{aligned}(2n, d) = \; & (32,8), (34,8), (36,8), (38,8), (40,8), (42,10), (44,10), (46,10), \\ & (48,10), (50,10), (52,10), (54,10), (56,12), (58,12), (60,12), \\ & (62,12), (64,12), (66,12), (68,12), (70,12), (72,14),\end{aligned}$$

the possible weight enumerators $W_{2n,d} = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} A_i y^i$ of a formally self-dual even $[2n, n, d]$ code can be determined as follows. The coefficients A_i ($i = 0, d, d+2, d+4, d+6$) are listed in Table 1, where a, b, c are integers. For

$(2n, d) = (32, 8)$, $(34, 8)$, $(36, 8)$, $(38, 8)$, $(42, 10)$, $(44, 10)$ and $(46, 10)$, the weight enumerator $W_{2n,d}$ is completely determined by only A_d. For $(2n, d) = (40, 8)$, $(48, 10)$, $(50, 10)$, $(52, 10)$, $(54, 10)$, $(56, 12)$, $(56, 12)$, $(58, 12)$, $(60, 12)$ and $(62, 12)$, the weight enumerator $W_{2n,d}$ is completely determined by A_d and A_{d+2}. For the remaining values of $(2n, d)$, the weight enumerator $W_{2n,d}$ is completely determined by A_d, A_{d+2} and A_{d+4}.

Table 1: Possible weight enumerators $W_{2n,d}$

$(2n, d)$	A_0	A_d	A_{d+2}	A_{d+4}	A_{d+6}
$(32, 8)$	1	a	$4960 - 8a$	$-3472 + 28a$	$34720 - 56a$
$(34, 8)$	1	a	$4114 - 7a$	$2516 + 20a$	$29172 - 28a$
$(36, 8)$	1	a	$3366 - 6a$	$6630 + 13a$	$30600 - 8a$
$(38, 8)$	1	a	$2717 - 5a$	$9177 + 7a$	$35910 + 5a$
$(40, 8)$	1	a	$-4a + b$	$32110 + 2a - 10b$	$-54720 + 12a + 45b$
$(42, 10)$	1	a	$26117 - 9a$	$-10455 + 35a$	$286713 - 75a$
$(44, 10)$	1	a	$21021 - 8a$	$19712 + 26a$	$250778 - 40a$
$(46, 10)$	1	a	$16744 - 7a$	$38709 + 18a$	$249458 - 14a$
$(48, 10)$	1	a	$-6a + b$	$207552 + 11a - 12b$	$-606441 + 4a + 66b$
$(50, 10)$	1	a	$-5a + b$	$166600 + 5a - 11b$	$-271950 + 15a + 54b$
$(52, 10)$	1	a	$-4a + b$	$132600 - 10b$	$-41990 + 20a + 43b$
$(54, 10)$	1	a	$-3a + b$	$104652 - 4a - 9b$	$107406 + 20a + 33b$
$(56, 12)$	1	a	$-8a + b$	$1343034 + 24a - 14b$	$-5765760 - 24a + 91b$
$(58, 12)$	1	a	$-7a + b$	$1067838 + 16a - 13b$	$-3224452 + 77b$
$(60, 12)$	1	a	$-6a + b$	$843030 + 9a - 12b$	$-1454640 + 16a + 64b$
$(62, 12)$	1	a	$-5a + b$	$660858 + 3a - 11b$	$-270940 + 25a + 52b$
$(64, 12)$	1	a	$-4a + b$	$-2a - 10b + c$	$8707776 + 28a + 41b - 16c$
$(66, 12)$	1	a	$-3a + b$	$-6a - 9b + c$	$6874010 + 26a + 31b - 15c$
$(68, 12)$	1	a	$-2a + b$	$-9a - 8b + c$	$5393454 + 20a + 22b - 14c$
$(70, 12)$	1	a	$-a + b$	$-11a - 7b + c$	$4206125 + 11a + 14b - 13c$
$(72, 14)$	1	a	$-6a + b$	$7a - 12b + c$	$56583450 + 28a + 62b - 18c$

4 Performance of double circulant even codes

A classification of optimal double circulant even codes was given in [10] for lengths up to 30. For lengths $2n$ with $32 \leq 2n \leq 72$, by determining the largest minimum weights d_P (resp. d_B), our exhaustive search found all distinct pure (resp. bordered) double circulant even codes satisfying conditions (C1)–(C3). This was done by considering all $n \times n$ circulant matrices R in (2)

(resp. $n-1 \times n-1$ circulant matrices R' in (3)) satisfying the condition given in Lemma 1. Since a cyclic shift of the first row for a code defines an equivalent code, the elimination of cyclic shifts substantially reduced the number of codes which had to be checked further for equivalence to complete the classification. Then MAGMA [1] was employed to determine code equivalence which completed the classification.

In Table 2, we list the numbers N_P and N_B of inequivalent pure and bordered double circulant even codes satisfying conditions (C1)–(C3), respectively. In Table 2, we also list d_P, A_{d_P}, d_B and A_{d_B}. For the pure and bordered double circulant even codes satisfying conditions (C1)–(C3), the first rows of R in (2) and R' in (3) are listed in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. The minimum weights d and (A_d, A_{d+2}, A_{d+4}) are also listed in the tables.

Table 2: Double circulant even codes satisfying (C1)–(C3)

$2n$	d_P	A_{d_P}	N_P	d_B	A_{d_B}	N_B	d_{SD}	$A_{d_{SD}}$	
32	8	348	2	8	300	1	8	364	[5]
34	8	272	15	8	272	10	6	-	
36	8	153	4	8	153	3	8	225	[5]
38	8	76	1	8	72	1	8	171	[5]
40	8	25	1	8	38	2	8	125	[5]
42	10	1680	2	10	1682	1	8	-	
44	10	1144	1	10	1267	3	8	-	
46	10	851	1	10	858	2	10	1012	[5]
48	10	480	1	10	575	1	12	17296	[5]
50	10	325	1	10	356	1	10	196	[20]
52	10	156	1	10	150	1	10	250	[5]
54	10	27	1	10	52	1	10	7-135	[3], [5]
56	12	4060	1	10	3	1	12	4606-8190	[5]
58	12	3161	1	12	3227	1	10	-	
60	12	2095	1	12	2146	1	12	2555	[23]
62	12	1333	1	12	1290	1	12	1860	[6]
64	12	544	1	12	806	1	12	1312	[4]
66	12	374	1	12	480	1	12	858	[5] (see [7])
68	12	136	1	12	165	1	12	442-486	[7], [26]
70	12	35	1	14	12172	1	12-14	-	
72	14	8064	1	14	8190	1	12-16	-	

To compare the performance of the optimal double circulant even codes which are not self-dual as measured by the decoding error probability with

bounded distance decoding, we list in Table 2 the largest minimum weight d_{SD} among self-dual codes of length $2n$. We also list the smallest number A_{SD} of codewords of minimum weight d_{SD} among self-dual codes of length $2n$ and minimum weight d_{SD}, when $d_P = d_{SD}$ or $d_B = d_{SD}$, along with the references. From Table 2, we have the following results concerning the performance of optimal double circulant even codes which are not self-dual.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that*

$$\begin{aligned}(2n, d) =&(32, 8), (36, 8), (38, 8), (40, 8), (46, 10), (52, 10),\\ &(56, 12), (60, 12), (62, 12), (64, 12), (66, 12), (68, 12).\end{aligned}$$

Then there is an optimal double circulant even $[2n, n, d]$ code C which is not self-dual such that C performs better than any self-dual $[2n, n, d]$ code.

Remark 3.

(1) For $2n = 34, 42, 44, 58$, there is a double circulant even code C of length $2n$ which is not self-dual such that C has a larger minimum weight than any self-dual code of length $2n$.

(2) Up to equivalence, there is a unique extremal doubly even self-dual $[48, 24, 12]$ code [18]. There is no double circulant even $[48, 24, d]$ code with $d \geq 12$ which is not self-dual.

(3) There is a self-dual $[50, 25, 10]$ code C such that C performs better than any double circulant even $[50, 25, 10]$ code which is not self-dual [20].

(4) There is a double circulant even $[70, 35, 14]$ code. The largest minimum weight among currently known self-dual codes of length 70 is 12. The weight enumerator of an extremal self-dual $[70, 35, 14]$ code C is uniquely determined and the number of codewords of weight 14 is 11730 [8]. If there is such a code C, then C performs better than any double circulant even $[70, 35, 14]$ code which is not self-dual.

(5) There is a double circulant even $[72, 36, 14]$ code. The largest minimum weight among currently known self-dual codes of length 72 is 12. The existence of an extremal doubly even self-dual $[72, 36, 16]$ code is a long-standing open question [24] (see also [22, Section 12]).

At the end of this section, we examine the equivalence of some codes in Tables 3 and 4. We verified by MAGMA [1] that there is no pair of equivalent codes among $P_{34,i}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, 15)$ and $B_{34,i}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, 10)$, and that there is no pair of equivalent codes among $P_{36,i}$ $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $B_{36,i}$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$. A formally self-dual even $[70, 35, 14]$ code C_{70} can be found in [11]. The code C_{70} is equivalent to some bordered double circulant codes, and C_{70} and B_{70} have identical weight enumerators [11]. Hence, B_{70} must be equivalent to C_{70}.

5 Self-dual codes of length 54

In this section, we consider the remaining case. Table 2 gives rise to a natural question, namely, is there a self-dual $[54, 27, 10]$ code such that $A_{10} < 27$? A self-dual $[54, 27, 10]$ code C and its shadow S (see [5] for the definition of shadows), have the following possible weight enumerators $W_i(C)$ and $W_i(S)$, respectively $(i = 1, 2)$:

$$\begin{cases} W_1(C) &= 1 + (351 - 8\beta)y^{10} + (5031 + 24\beta)y^{12} + \cdots, \\ W_1(S) &= \beta y^7 + (2808 - 10\beta)y^{11} + \cdots, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} W_2(C) &= 1 + (351 - 8\beta)y^{10} + (5543 + 24\beta)y^{12} + \cdots, \\ W_2(S) &= y^3 + (-12 + \beta)y^7 + (2874 - 10\beta)y^{11} + \cdots, \end{cases}$$

where β is an integer with $0 \le \beta \le 43$ for $i = 1$ and $12 \le \beta \le 43$ for $i = 2$ [5]. Self-dual codes exist with $W_1(C)$ for $\beta = 0, 1, \ldots, 20, 22, 26$ and self-dual codes exist with $W_2(C)$ for $\beta = 12, 13, \ldots, 22, 24, 26, 27$ (see [3], [5], [19], [25], [27]). Note that the smallest number A_{10} among currently known self-dual codes of length 54 and minimum weight 10 is 135.

Proposition 4. *If there is a self-dual* $[54, 27, 10]$ *code* C *such that* $A_{10} < 27$*, then* C *has weight enumerator* $W_1(C)$ *with* $41 \le \beta \le 43$.

Proof. Let C be a self-dual $[54, 27, 10]$ code such that $A_{10} < 27$. Suppose that C has weight enumerator $W_2(C)$. From the assumption, $\beta > 12$. Thus, there is a vector of weight 7 in the shadow S. Let x_1 and x_2 be vectors of weights 3 and 7 in S, respectively. Since the sum of two distinct vectors of S is a codeword of C, $x_1 + x_2$ must be a codeword of weight 10. From the coefficient of y^7 in $W_2(S)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 351 - 8\beta &\ge \beta - 12 \\ 40 &\ge \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Table 3: Pure double circulant even codes satisfying (C1)–(C3)

Code	First row	d	(A_d, A_{d+2}, A_{d+4})
$P_{32,1}$	(1100101100110101)	8	$(348, 2176, 6272)$
$P_{32,2}$	(1110110100010011)	8	$(348, 2176, 6272)$
$P_{34,1}$	(11111110001000100)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,2}$	(11100000111010110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,3}$	(11110101101101100)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,4}$	(11110011101101010)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,5}$	(10001011101100000)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,6}$	(10001100110010100)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,7}$	(11101110110100000)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,8}$	(10100101100011110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,9}$	(10100100110010001)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,10}$	(10101010011111000)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,11}$	(10001110000100110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,12}$	(11010010010001111)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,13}$	(10001100001110100)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,14}$	(11011010100001101)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{34,15}$	(11100001101010011)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$P_{36,1}$	(101011110110000001)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
$P_{36,2}$	(111100001000010111)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
$P_{36,3}$	(100110111010010001)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
$P_{36,4}$	(100001010110111100)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
P_{38}	(11110000010010110110)	8	$(76, 2337, 9709)$
P_{40}	(10101101111101111000)	8	$(25, 2080, 10360)$
$P_{42,1}$	(1000011010111001011O)	10	$(1680, 10997, 48345)$
$P_{42,2}$	(1010100101011101101111)	10	$(1680, 10997, 48345)$
P_{44}	(1001111111001011011011)	10	$(1144, 11869, 49456)$
P_{46}	(1100101101011110000001)	10	$(851, 10787, 54027)$
P_{48}	(1101110001011111011O100)	10	$(480, 10384, 53664)$
P_{50}	(1000100001011001001011101)	10	$(325, 8650, 55200)$
P_{52}	(1000101010001101101100001)	10	$(156, 7267, 53690)$
P_{54}	(1110000000111011011000100111)	10	$(27, 6030, 49545)$
P_{56}	(1001100011110101110111110100)	12	$(4060, 49420, 293874)$
P_{58}	(1101100001010000000011001101O)	12	$(3161, 41412, 292407)$
P_{60}	(1000001011011100001001110100O1)	12	$(2095, 37320, 263205)$
P_{62}	(0010100111101100111111010000000)	12	$(1333, 30597, 254975)$
P_{64}	(1010100011001011110011010000000O)	12	$(544, 34304, 115756)$
P_{66}	(1001000100100001011110111001000O0)	12	$(374, 20163, 203808)$
P_{68}	(1001001011010110101010101011000000)	12	$(136, 15606, 176936)$
P_{70}	(0101101110011010010111000011000000O)	12	$(35, 11550, 151130)$
P_{72}	(1011011011010011010011011111000100O0)	14	$(8064, 127809, 1202464)$

Table 4: Bordered double circulant even codes satisfying (C1)–(C3)

Code	First row	d	(A_d, A_{d+2}, A_{d+4})
B_{32}	(100101010001111)	8	$(300, 2560, 4928)$
$B_{34,1}$	(1001101010001101)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,2}$	(1110111100010110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,3}$	(1010100111011101)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,4}$	(1000110111011110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,5}$	(1110010011010001)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,6}$	(1101101100101000)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,7}$	(1001001100111010)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,8}$	(1110000111110110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,9}$	(1110000111011110)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{34,10}$	(1001010011010011)	8	$(272, 2210, 7956)$
$B_{36,1}$	(11001011010011101)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
$B_{36,2}$	(11011100001010111)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
$B_{36,3}$	(10001000101011011)	8	$(153, 2448, 8619)$
B_{38}	(110000101101101000)	8	$(72, 2357, 9681)$
$B_{40,1}$	(1100000111101000100)	8	$(38, 2014, 10526)$
$B_{40,2}$	(1010011001110001110)	8	$(38, 2014, 10526)$
B_{42}	(10011111001111010010)	10	$(1682, 10979, 48415)$
$B_{44,1}$	(101010000011101100110)	10	$(1267, 10885, 52654)$
$B_{44,2}$	(111100011011101010111)	10	$(1267, 10885, 52654)$
$B_{44,3}$	(110000111111101101101)	10	$(1267, 10885, 52654)$
$B_{46,1}$	(111010001011100011000)	10	$(858, 10738, 54153)$
$B_{46,2}$	(111110011111001000101)	10	$(858, 10738, 54153)$
B_{48}	(110101010000100111000010)	10	$(575, 9752, 55453)$
B_{50}	(111110011001100111100010)	10	$(356, 8524, 55036)$
B_{52}	(101000100010100110010010 1)	10	$(150, 7375, 52850)$
B_{54}	(111010110110000000100011 10)	10	$(52, 5876, 50156)$
B_{56}	(100111100001001000000100011)	10	$(3, 4545, 45477)$
B_{58}	(110110100001010011110011 0111)	12	$(3227, 40950, 293463)$
B_{60}	(110011011111001010101111011 00)	12	$(2146, 36163, 273876)$
B_{62}	(110010100011110110110000000000)	12	$(1290, 30850, 254428)$
B_{64}	(100001010101101001101101000000)	12	$(806, 25358, 226982)$
B_{66}	(101011101111011001111111011010000)	12	$(480, 19848, 203112)$
B_{68}	(100011110101110110010101010100000)	12	$(165, 15620, 176099)$
B_{70}	(110100010111010010101111000000000)	14	$(12172, 147390, 1352811)$
B_{72}	(100111101011111001011110011101110 00)	14	$(8190, 126952, 1204560)$

Hence, we have that $A_{10} \geq 31$, which is a contradiction. It follows from $A_{10} < 27$ that $41 \leq \beta \leq 43$ in $W_1(C)$. □

Hence, the above question can be refined as follows.

Question 5. Is there a self-dual $[54, 27, 10]$ code which has weight enumerator $W_1(C)$ with $41 \leq \beta \leq 43$?

As a consequence of the proof of the above proposition, we have the following.

Corollary 6. *If there is a self-dual* $[54, 27, 10]$ *code with weight enumerator* $W_2(C)$*, then* $\beta \in \{12, 13, \ldots, 40\}$.

6 Performance of extremal self-dual codes of lengths 88 and 112

The performance of extremal doubly even and singly even self-dual codes was compared in [2, Section 4] for lengths $24k + 8$ $(k = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $24k + 16$ $(k = 1, 2)$. In this section, we consider the case for lengths $24k+16$ $(k = 3, 4)$.

An extremal doubly even self-dual code of length 88 has the following weight enumerator (see [21]):

$$1 + 32164y^{16} + 6992832y^{20} + 535731625y^{24} + \cdots .$$

There are at least 470 inequivalent extremal doubly even self-dual codes of length 88 (see [13]). An extremal singly even self-dual code of length 88 was given in [17] which has the following weight enumerator:

$$1 + 18436y^{16} + 268928y^{18} + 3493248y^{20} + 267717065y^{24} + \cdots .$$

Hence, there is an extremal singly even self-dual code C of length 88 such that C performs better than any extremal doubly even self-dual code of that length.

An extremal doubly even self-dual code of length 112 has the following weight enumerator (see [21]):

$$1 + 355740y^{20} + 95307030y^{24} + 10847290300y^{28} + \cdots .$$

An extremal doubly even self-dual code of length 112 was found in [15]. By [5, Theorem 5], the possible weight enumerators $W_i(C)$ and $W_i(S)$ of an extremal singly even self-dual code C of length 112 and its shadow S are:

$$\begin{cases} W_1(C) &= 1+(157388+16a)y^{20}+(3125056-64a)y^{22} \\ & \quad +(52740406-160a)y^{24}+\cdots, \\ W_1(S) &= y^4+(-2002+a)y^{16}+(428099-20a)y^{20}+\cdots, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} W_2(C) &= 1+(157388+16a)y^{20}+(3431232+1024b-64a)y^{22} \\ & \quad +(48040246-10240b-160a)y^{24}+\cdots, \\ W_2(S) &= y^8+(-24-b)y^{12}+(276+22b+a)y^{16} \\ & \quad +(394680-231b-20a)y^{20}+\cdots, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} W_3(C) &= 1+(157388+16a)y^{20}+(3431232+1024b-64a)y^{22} \\ & \quad +(47974710-10240b-160a)y^{24}+\cdots, \\ W_3(S) &= -by^{12}+(22b+a)y^{16}+(396704-231b-20a)y^{20}+\cdots, \end{cases}$$

where a, b are integers. Currently, it is not known whether there is an extremal singly even self-dual code of length 112.

Acknowledgment. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15H03633.

References

[1] W. Bosma, J. Cannon and C. Playoust, The Magma algebra system I: The user language, *J. Symbolic Comput.* **24** (1997), 235–265.

[2] S. Bouyuklieva, A. Malevich and W. Willems, On the performance of binary extremal self-dual codes, *Adv. Math. Commun.* **5** (2011), 267–274.

[3] S. Bouyuklieva and P.R.J. Östergård, New constructions of optimal self-dual binary codes of length 54, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **41** (2006), 101–109.

[4] N. Chigira, M. Harada and M. Kitazume, Extremal self-dual codes of length 64 through neighbors and covering radii, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **42** (2007), 93–101.

[5] J.H. Conway and N.J.A. Sloane, A new upper bound on the minimal distance of self-dual codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **36** (1990), 1319–1333.

[6] R. Dontcheva and M. Harada, New extremal self-dual codes of length 62 and related extremal self-dual codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **48** (2002), 2060–2064.

[7] S.T. Dougherty, T.A. Gulliver and M. Harada, Extremal binary self-dual codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **43** (1997), 2036–2047.

[8] S.T. Dougherty and M. Harada, New extremal self-dual codes of length 68, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **45** (1999), 2133–2136.

[9] A. Faldum, J. Lafuente, G. Ochoa and W. Willems, Error probabilities for bounded distance decoding, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **40** (2006), 237–252.

[10] T.A. Gulliver and M. Harada, Classification of extremal double circulant formally self-dual even codes, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **11** (1997), 25–35.

[11] T.A. Gulliver and M. Harada, The existence of a formally self-dual even $[70, 35, 14]$ code, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **11** (1998), 95–98.

[12] T.A. Gulliver and M. Harada, Classification of extremal double circulant self-dual codes of lengths 64 to 72, *Des. Codes and Cryptogr.* **13** (1998), 257–269.

[13] T.A. Gulliver and M. Harada, Classification of extremal double circulant self-dual codes of lengths 74–88, *Discrete Math.* **306** (2006), 2064–2072.

[14] T.A. Gulliver and M. Harada, On extremal double circulant self-dual codes of lengths 90 and 92, (submitted), arXiv:1601.07343.

[15] M. Harada, An extremal doubly even self-dual code of length 112, *Electron. J. Combin.* **15** (2008), Note 33, 5 pp.

[16] M. Harada, T.A. Gulliver and H. Kaneta, Classification of extremal double-circulant self-dual codes of length up to 62, *Discrete Math.* **188** (1998), 127–136.

[17] M. Harada and T. Nishimura, An extremal singly even self-dual code of length 88, *Adv. Math. Commun.* **1** (2007), 261–267.

[18] S.K. Houghten, C.W.H. Lam, L.H. Thiel and J.A. Parker, The extended quadratic residue code is the only $(48, 24, 12)$ self-dual doubly-even code, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **49** (2003), 53–59.

[19] W.C. Huffman, On the classification and enumeration of self-dual codes, *Finite Fields Appl.* **11** (2005), 451–490.

[20] W.C. Huffman and V.D. Tonchev, The existence of extremal self-dual $[50, 25, 10]$ codes and quasi-symmetric 2-$(49, 9, 6)$ designs, *Des. Codes and Cryptogr.* **6** (1996), 97–106.

[21] C.L. Mallows and N.J.A. Sloane, An upper bound for self-dual codes, *Inform. Control* **22** (1973), 188–200.

[22] E. Rains and N.J.A. Sloane, Self-dual codes, Handbook of Coding Theory, V.S. Pless and W.C. Huffman (Editors), Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1998, pp. 177–294.

[23] R. Russeva and N. Yankov, On binary self-dual codes of lengths 60, 62, 64 and 66 having an automorphism of order 9, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **45** (2007), 335–346.

[24] N.J.A. Sloane, Is there a $(72, 36)$ $d = 16$ self-dual code? *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **19** (1973), 251.

[25] N. Yankov and M.H. Lee, New binary self-dual codes of lengths $50 - 60$, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **73** (2014), 983–996.

[26] N. Yankov, M.H. Lee, M. Gürel and M. Ivanova, Self-dual codes with an automorphism of order 11, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **61** (2015), 1188–1193.

[27] N. Yankov and R. Russeva, Binary self-dual codes of lengths 52 to 60 with an automorphism of order 7 or 13, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **57** (2011), 7498–7506.